UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,032	10/06/2003	Marcio dos Santos Galli	AOL0139	5291

22862   7590   05/04/2007
GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/680,032	GALLI ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Benjamin R. Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 October 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20040227</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-33 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on 2/27/04 has been considered.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of

browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other

form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. (Page 31, line 5; Paragraph 107)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and
> distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claim 4, 5, 10, 12, 25, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as
being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter
which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the other side" of said session. What does this term mean

or refer to. Claim 4 also mentions the user's "message protocol." There is insufficient antecedent

basis for this limitation in the claim. Similar limitations recited in claim 5.

Claims 10, 12, 25, 29 recites the limitation registered application agent can be "stacked."

Stacked has an accepted meaning with the use of queues but the examiner is unsure of the

meaning and use of the term stacked in this context. Does applicant just refer to a stacked view?

Applicant is requested to reword and explain.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "the users." Maybe applicant is erroneously interchanging clients

and users here? There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 11-12; 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al.

Regarding claim 1, a system for providing real-time communication over a global network

between two or more users, each of said users using a device communicatively coupled to the

global network (Yairi: page 2, para 23), said system comprising:

a client messaging application which runs on the users' devices, said client application

providing a user interface displayed on each user's device screen (Yairi: page 2, para 23), said

user interface comprising:

a message entry window for the user to enter data (Yairi: Fig. 8B);

a communication window for displaying messages entered in a session (Yairi: Fig. 8B);

and

means for accessing one or more application agents, each of which being associated to an

external application (Yairi: pages 1-2, para 9, page 4, para 38);

wherein when any of said application agents is activated, the external application

represented by said activated application agent runs on top of the client messaging application such that all users in said session can instantly use the external application represented by said activated application agent without leaving said session (Yairi: page 2, para 10; page 4, para 33).

Regarding claim 2, the system of claim 1, wherein said external application is either a local application in the user's device or a third party service on the global network (Yairi: pages 1-2, para 9; page 3, para 25).

Regarding claim 3, the system of claim 2, wherein said third party service on the global network is any of: an instant translation service; a speech synthesis service; an automatic publishing service; a picture sharing service; a map sharing service; a quote service; and a Web search engine (Yairi: page 5, para 41, 47).

Regarding claim 4, the system of claim 1, wherein said activated application agent addresses other applications on the other side of said session via the user's message protocol (Yairi: page 2, para 10).

Regarding claim 11, the system of claim 1, wherein said means for accessing is a selection window (Yairi: page 4, para 39; Fig 4, 8A).

Regarding claim 12, the system of claim 11, wherein said selection window displays any of:

a list of unregistered application agents, each of which being available to be stacked on said client messaging application; and

a list of registered application agents, each of which being already stacked on said client messaging application and is immediately available to be activated by the user (Yairi: page 4, para 39; Fig. 4, 8A).

Regarding claim 25, a method for incorporating external resources into an instant messaging session supported by an instant messaging system (Yairi: page 2, para 23), said instant

messaging system comprising a client messaging application which runs on a number of devices communicatively coupled to the Internet (Yairi: page 2, para 23), comprising the steps of:

said client messaging application providing a user interface displayed on each device's screen from which the users communicate with each other (Yairi: page 2, para 23), said user interface comprising a message entry window for the user to enter data (Yairi: Fig. 8B), a communication window for displaying messages entered in a session (Yairi: Fig. 8B), and a selection window for accessing one or more application agents, each of said application agents being associated to an external application (Yairi: pages 1-2, para 9, page 4, para 38), the method further comprising the steps of:

activating a registered application agent from a list of registered application agents, wherein each of said registered application agents is stacked on said client messaging application and is instantly available to be activated by the user (Yairi: page 2, para 10; page 4, para 33); and

sharing the external application to which said activated application agent is associated (Yairi: page 2, para 10; page 4, para 33).

Regarding claim 26, the method of claim 25, wherein said external application is either a local application in the user's device or a third party service on the Internet (Yairi: page 2, para 23).

Regarding claim 27, the method of claim 26, wherein said third party service on the Internet is any of: an instant translation service; a speech synthesis service; an automatic publishing service; a picture sharing service; a map sharing service; a quote service; and a Web search engine (Yairi: page 5, para 41, 47).

Regarding claim 28, the method of claim 25, wherein at least one of said registered application agents is associated to an interactive service (Yairi: pages 1-2, para 9; page 3, para 25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040125924 by McMullin et al.

Regarding claim 5, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 4. The Yairi reference fails to state binary data.

However, the McMullin reference teaches data transferred via the user's message protocol for addressing other applications on the other side of said session is a sequence of characters that represents binary data (McMullin: page 3, para 34) in order to send data through a digital communications network (McMullin: page 3, para 34).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by Yairi to include binary data as taught by McMullin in order to send data through a digital communications network (McMullin: page 3, para 34).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040174392 by Bjoernsen et al.

Regarding claim 6, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said means for accessing one or more application agents further comprises:

means for displaying a plurality of distinct visual cues, each of which being representative of one of said application agents (Yairi: page 4, para 39; Fig. 4, 8A); and

means for associating one or more of said visual cues to a contact in the user's contact list (Yairi: page 4, para 39; Fig. 4, 8A).

The Yairi reference fails to state associating contacts based on prior use or frequency.

However, the Bjoernsen reference teaches association being based on the user's prior use or/and use frequency, with said contact, of the application agents represented by said visual cues (Bjoernsen: page 1, para 6; Fig. 10) in order to allow collaboration between users over instant

messaging services (Bjornsen: page 1, para 2, 4).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by Yairi to include a buddy list with popular and frequently used contacts as taught by Bjoernsen in order to allow collaboration between users over instant messaging services (Bjornsen: page 1, para 2, 4).

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040174392 by Bjoernsen et al in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030177184 by Dickerman et al.

Regarding claim 7, the modified Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 6. The modified Yairi reference fails to teach the agent automatically activated.

However, the Dickerman reference teaches when a contact joins said session, the application agent represented by said associated visual cue is automatically activated (Dickerman: pages 6-7, para 34-36) in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Yairi to include automatically activating an agent when a user joins in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

Regarding claim 8, the modified Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 6. The modified Yairi reference fails to teach the agent automatically activated.

However, the Dickerman reference teaches, wherein any of said application agents can be registered as a contact in the user's list of contacts (Dickerman: page 7, para 36) in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Yairi to include automatically activating an agent when a user joins in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered

application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

Regarding claim 9, the modified Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 8, wherein at least one of said registered application agents is associated to an interactive service (Yairi: pages 1-2, para 9; page 3, para 25),

Regarding claim 10, the modified Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 9. The modified Yairi reference fails to teach the other registered agents stacked on a registered agent.

However, the Dickerman reference teaches, wherein any other registered application agent can be stacked on said registered application agent associated to the interactive service (Dickerman: page 7, para 36) in order to allow users to invite other users to collaborate with other registered applications (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Yairi to include automatically activating an agent when a user joins in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with other registered applications (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

Claims 13-20, 22; 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,562 by Pennock et al.

Regarding claim 13, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 12.

The Yairi reference fails to state registering by dragging.

However, the Pennock reference teaches the user can register an application agent by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent from said list of unregistered application agents to said list of registered application agents (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; col. 8, lines 44-54; Fig. 6) in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include register an application agent by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent as taught by Pennock in order to

allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 14, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 13.

The Yairi reference fails to state registering by a symbol.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, wherein said symbol is an icon or a title (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; Fig. 6) in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include a symbol representative of said application agent as taught by Pennock in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 15, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 12.

The Yairi reference fails to state unregistering by dragging.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, wherein the user can unregister a registered application agent by leaving (Pennock: col. 16, lines 10-22) and a user can register application agents by dragging (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; col. 8, lines 44-54; Fig. 6) in order to allow users to leave and close sessions (Pennock: col. 16, lines 10-22).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include a unregistering agent applications by dragging as taught by Pennock in order to allow users to leave and close sessions (Pennock: col. 16, lines 10-22).

Regarding claim 16, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 12.

The Yairi reference fails to state registering by clicking.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, wherein the user can register an application agent by applying one or more mouse-clicking commands (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-54) in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include regi mouse-clicking as taught by Pennock in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 17, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 12.

The Yairi reference fails to state registering by dragging.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, wherein the user can activate a registered application agent by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent from said selection window to said communication window (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-54) in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include register an application agent by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent as taught by Pennock in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 18, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 17.

The Yairi reference fails to state registering by dragging a symbol.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, wherein said symbol is an icon or a title (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; Fig. 6) in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include register an application agent by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent as taught by Pennock in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 19, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 12.

The Yairi reference fails to state registering by mouse clicking.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, wherein the user can activate a registered application agent by applying one or more mouse-clicking commands (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; Fig. 6) in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include re mouse clicking as taught by Pennock in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 20, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 12.

The Yairi reference fails to state a local program.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, wherein the user can activate a registered application agent from a local application represented by a registered application agent (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; col. 2, lines 20-28; gaming utility application) in order to launch the users software to enable collaboration between users (Pennock: col. 2, lines 20-28).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include registered application agent from a local application as taught by Pennock in order to launch the users software to enable collaboration between users (Pennock: col. 2, lines 20-28).

Regarding claim 22, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 12.

The Yairi reference fails to state updating the list of unregistered agents.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, wherein said list of unregistered application agents is updated without need of changing said client application (Pennock: col. 2, lines 36-44) in order to display the availability status of entities in the buddy list (Pennock: col. 2, lines 36-44).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include updating the list of unregistered agents as taught by Pennock in order to display the avaibility status of entities in the buddy list (Pennock: col. 2, lines 36-44).

Regarding claim 30, the Yairi reference teaches the method of claim 25.

The Yairi reference fails to teach registering by dragging.

However the Pennock reference teaches:

registering an application agent by applying a number of mouse-clicking commands (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; col. 8, lines 44-54; Fig. 6) in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67); and

unregistering a registered application agent by applying a number of mouse-clicking commands (Pennock: col. 16, lines 10-22) in order to allow users to leave and close sessions (Pennock: col. 16, lines 10-22).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include register and unregister application agents by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent as taught by Pennock in order to allow a user users to join or leave collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,562 by Pennock et al in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040174392 by Bjoernsen et al

Regarding claim 21, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 13.

The Yairi reference fails to state alias symbols.

However, the Pennock reference teaches, further comprising: means for associating an alias of said symbol to a contact in the user's contact list (Pennock: col. 7, lines 50-62), in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include register an application agent by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent as taught by Pennock in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

The modified Yairi reference fails to teach the associating based on prior user or

frequency.

However, the Bjoernsen reference teaches an association being based on the user's prior use or/and use frequency, with said contact, of the application agent represented by said symbol (Bjoernsen: page 1, para 6; Fig. 10) in order to allow collaboration between users over instant messaging services (Bjornsen: page 1, para 2, 4).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Yairi to include a buddy list with popular and frequently used contacts as taught by Bjoernsen in order to allow collaboration between users over instant messaging services (Bjornsen: page 1, para 2, 4).

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030177184 by Dickerman et al.

Regarding claim 23, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 1. The Yairi reference fails to state activating agents upon inviting another user.

However, the Dickerman reference teaches means for inviting another user to activate one of said application agents in the session (Dickerman: page 7, para 41) in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skillin the art to create the system as taught by modified Yairi to include automatically activating an agent when a user joins in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

Regarding claim 24, the Yairi reference teaches the system of claim 1 The Yairi reference fails to state activating agents upon inviting another user.

However, the Dickerman reference teaches, wherein said user interface further comprises: means for initiating synchronous sharing of a third party service represented by an activated application agent (Dickerman: page 2, para 24, 26; page 7, para 36) in order to allow a

user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Yairi to include automatically activating an agent when a user joins in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030177184 by Dickerman et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,562 by Pennock et al.

Regarding claim 29, the modified Yairi reference teaches the method of claim 24.

The modified Yairi reference fails to teach registering by dragging.

However the Pennock reference teaches:

registering an application agent by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent from a list of unregistered application agents to said list of registered application agents, wherein each of said unregistered application agents is available to be stacked on said client application (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; col. 8, lines 44-54; Fig. 6) in order to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

unregistering a registered application agent by leaving or closing a session (Pennock: col. 16, lines 10-22) and Pennock teaches an interface that uses dragging (Pennock: col. 6, lines 6-32; col. 8, lines 44-54; Fig. 6) in order to allow users to leave and close sessions (Pennock: col. 16, lines 10-22).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of claim 12 as taught by Yairi to include register and unregister application agents by dragging a symbol representative of said application agent as taught by Pennock in order to allow a user users to join or leave collaboration session (Pennock: col. 8, lines 44-67).

Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 20040078424 by Yairi et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030177184 by Dickerman et al in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040174392 by

Bjoernsen et al

Regarding claim 31, the modified Yairi reference teaches the method of claim 24, comprising:

associating one or more of visual cues to a contact in the user's contact list (Yairi: page 4, para 39; Fig. 4, 8A), each visual cue representing one of said registered application agents (Yairi: page 4, para 39; Fig. 4, 8A).

The modified Yairi reference fails to state associating based on prior use or frequency.

However, the Bjoernsen reference teaches association being based on the user's prior use or/and use frequency, with said contact, of the application agents represented by said visual cues (Bjoernsen: page 1, para 6; Fig. 10) in order to allow collaboration between users over instant messaging services (Bjornsen: page 1, para 2, 4).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Yairi to include a buddy list with popular and frequently used contacts as taught by Bjoernsen in order to allow collaboration between users over instant messaging services (Bjornsen: page 1, para 2, 4).

Regarding claim 32, the Yairi reference teaches the method of claim 31.

The Yairi reference fails to teach the agent automatically activated.

However, the Dickerman reference teaches when a contact joins said session, the application agent represented by said associated visual cue is automatically activated (Dickerman: pages 6-7, para 34-36) in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Yairi to include automatically activating an agent when a user joins in order to allow a user to invite other users to collaborate with the registered application (Dickerman: page 7, para 36).

Regarding claim 33, the method of claim 31, wherein said contact can be any of:

a screen name representing a human contact (Yairi: Fig. 8B);

a name or a visual cue representing an interactive service; and

a name or visual cue representing one of said registered application agents.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent Pub No. 20040267885 by Zimmermann et al teaches smart IM bot features with status and control over devices (page 1, 11-14; page 3, para 33, 39-44).

U. S. Patent Pub No. 20030018725 by Turner teaches instant messaging environment for collaboration in real time between two users (page 2, para 17).

U.S. Patent Pub No. 20030217096 by McKelvie et al teaches network based translation with interop agents for bridging between IM systems and web services (page 5, para 59 and 67).

U.S. Patent Pub No. 20050044143 by Zimmermann et al teaches instant messaging enabled status and control over devices (Fig. 1-3).

U.S. Patent No. 7,188,143 by Szeto teaches controlling an application an instant messaging environment (col. 1, lines 26-58; col. 2, lines 24-65; col. 5, lines 2-18).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number 571-272-3982.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh

Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone numbers for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and

after final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this

application or proceeding should be directed to the examiner whose telephone number is 571-

272-3982.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner Art Unit 2155

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER